



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

WILLS—ALTERATION AND RE-EXECUTION—NECESSARY FORMALITIES.—Where a will duly executed was subsequently changed by interlineations and the testatrix, satisfied with the modifications, retraced her name with a dry pen and then stated to two new attesting witnesses that the instrument was her will and the new witnesses subscribed at her request, held that there was a re-execution of the will as modified justifying its probate as modified. *Wilson v. Graebner* (Mich. 1912) 137 N. W. 735.

The same authority and competency are required and the same solemnities and formalities must be observed to make a valid republication as are necessary to make a new will. WOERNER, ADMINISTRATION, p. 112. In many states there is a statutory requirement to that effect and all informal alterations are obnoxious to the policy of later legislation which prescribes, for wills of personality as well as realty, a formal subscription and attestation. SCHOULER, WILLS, (2 Ed.) § 432. In most jurisdictions a strict conformity is necessary, the requirements being the same in every jot and tittle as for the original execution of the will. *Re Shaffer*, 2 How. Pr. N. S. 494; *Lovell v. Quitman*, 88 N. Y. 377; *Hesterberg v. Clark*, 166 Ill. 241; *Dixon's Appeal*, 55 Penn. St. 424; *Esbach v. Collins*, 61 Md. 478; *Penniman's Will*, 20 Minn. 245. But in *Wright v. Wright*, 5 Ind. 389, an interlineation made after execution was probated without further subsequent re-signing or re-attestation, on the ground that it would be a useless formality. And that substantial, and not literal, compliance with the rule is all that is demanded, as stated in the principal case, see *Upchurch v. Upchurch*, 16 B. Mon. 112; *Porter v. Ford*, 82 Ky. 191; *Pool v. Pool* 89 S. W. 687; *Reynolds v. Shirley* 7 Oh. 323. In England the statute provides for the acknowledging and attestation of interlineations in the margin. In *Re Martin*, 6 No. Cas. 694, the testatrix after alterations made as here went over her signature with a dry pen and acknowledged in the presence of new witnesses who put their initials in the margin. And this was held not a sufficient re-execution. JARMAN, (5th Am. Ed. 85) criticises this holding on the ground that there was a sufficient showing of intent. But it is submitted that since the purpose of the rule is to prevent fraud, no slipshod compliance with its requirements should be permitted, and as for such a ruling as was made in this case, it renders a fraudulent re-execution easier than a forgery.

WILLS—CONSTRUCTION—INTENTION OF TESTATOR.—A will gave two daughters the home place "as long as they remain single, the one marrying first then giving up all her right and title to the unmarried sister." Both sisters married. Held that the first part of the clause gave to each a determinable life estate and that the second part should be confined to the life estates so given. *Ruggles v. Jennett* (Mass. 1912) 90 N. E. 1092.

Under a strict interpretation of these phrases, the daughter who first married would lose her entire right to the premises since all she had after her marriage would be the remainder in fee given by the residuary clause; this would go to the other sister to whom the second part of the clause does not by its terms apply. The court foresaw that this would result in giving the one daughter more than the other, and since they had concluded from